



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE LIMITATIONS OF SEX.\*

---

THE epigram is the refinement of the proverb. Both claim to be the crystallized expression of human experience. As the oracular sayings of the weather prophet influence the vulgar mind by the broad fitness of their Delphic generalities, so the authoritative dictum of the epigram fascinates the more cultured by the wide sweep of its dazzling comprehensiveness. To the intellectual epicure, well-presented pabulum possesses the fascination which the tempting mysteries of the French *cuisine* exercise upon the confiding traveler. Sophism becomes objectionable in the inverse ratio of its polish, and Shakespeare is rejected for Pope.

The particular merit of Miss Hardaker's "Ethics of Sex" is due to the pen of a clever stylist. Her racy sentences, her spicy antitheses, tickle the mental palate. A like superficial attraction is the ostentatious confession of natural inferiority in the female, by a professedly thinking member of the sex. This confession appeals as forcibly to the vanity of the man as its epigrammatic expression to the favor of the critic; but the careful reader, seeking for the source of Miss Hardaker's verbal cascades, discovers no clear rivulet of investigation by which they are nourished, but an apparently miraculous upheaval from a soil arid as Moses's rock.

When a cultivated woman deliberately endeavors to limit the widening sphere of feminine power, it becomes necessary to examine her assertions and arguments upon their own worth, allowing neither brilliancy of style nor quaintness of statement to influence a discussion fraught with vital interest. The labor question and the woman question are the problems of our time, and any new light by which their relative positions of employer and employé, of male and female, may be more fittingly adjusted, cannot fail to meet ultimate appreciation. We are yet in the condition of the midnight student who longs for

\* A review of Miss Hardaker's "Ethics of Sex," NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, July, 1880.

a touch of an Edison's wand to transform his dim lamp into a clear, diffusive jet.

The cant term of fashionable science, which Miss Hardaker, with characteristic love for high-sounding words, employs as a title to her essay, is as inapplicable as much of the illustration appended to it is inaccurate. The *ethics of sex* is the relative duties arising from normal divergences of male and female structure, or a code of laws based upon such duties. These duties Miss Hardaker, except in the single case of suffrage, does not attempt to discuss. She has merely set forth sexual distinctions which may eventually form the foundation of an enlightened legislation.

In furnishing such data, Miss Hardaker has primary recourse to psychology. From the study of characteristics, capabilities may be measurably educed. But psychological investigation alone cannot produce a permanent code of ethics, for psychological phenomena vary materially according to the stage of culture. Lasting ethical laws must be based upon some common rule to which all psychical manifestations may be referred. If the ecstacy of the saint, the enthusiasm of the prophet, the magnetic attractions and spiritual communings of soul to soul, as well as the most ordinary act of existence, could be found dependent on a certain well-defined conformation of physique, then could a new revelation be formulated which would cease to be of value only with the extinction of the species. The tendency of modern science points to anatomy as the key to the psychological problem. To anatomy, with physiology as its interpreter, Miss Hardaker therefore resorts.

Three distinct propositions, each bearing upon the other, are the foundations of Miss Hardaker's superstructure. They are as follows:

Quantity of power is in proportion to the size of the body; quantity of thought to the weight of the brain; kind of thought to the kind of brain.

Women are inferior in general culture. "What sufficient cause can there be for this relatively lower development than the relatively smaller bodies and brains of those who exhibit the defect?"

Man does more thinking than woman; his brain is known to be heavier; *ergo*, largeness of power and material are equal to each other. "Small brains cannot give birth to great thoughts."

Man does better thinking than woman in any department of effort common to both; *ergo*, his brains are more finely constituted. Therefore, "until nature gives woman as large and as finely constituted brain as man," she can never hope to attain his possible development. Until nature is reversed, woman must be considered an inferior being, and legislated for accordingly. Here is the pith of Miss Hardaker's contribution to the embryonic sexual code. The law of human gravitation has been found.

Before we accept so weighty a doctrine, a glance at the means of its advent would hardly be amiss. Every statement of scientific facts not so generally accepted as to have become axiomatic, must either be proved by satisfactory evidence or confirmed by standard authority. Now, none of the above assertions can be relegated unquestioningly to the realm of acknowledged truth, nor is proof or authority adduced in their favor.

Two facts cannot be said to be identical merely *because* they are coincident. Such coincidence, indeed, may suggest a possible connection, and thus furnish an incentive for experiment which may prove or disprove their apparent relation. Our most profound students have yet reached no definite conclusion upon the occult connection between brain and brain power. Special experiments have shown certain coincidences, but no physical test has yet been discovered by which kind and quality of thought may be measured.

Let us pause, however, before we dismiss unproved affirmations as false, though for all purposes of just controversy we may rightly consider them null. A further probing of the question may evolve the true law which underlies the sexual relation in its bearing upon civilization. In doing so, it must be remembered that the aim sought is to discover the normal relation of male to female; for only upon a determination of native capacity can modifications be properly estimated. An accurate comparison, however, can be reached only approximately. The examination, to be exact, must take place between original members of the species, and between them at a stage of similar development.

The culture of the sexes has been essentially different from its very outset. We may disagree regarding the causes of such divergence, but the fact is universally recognized. Our experience presents no ground for a precise calculation of relative sexual powers. We can but reason from external evidence.

The physical code of honor (for physical distinction is the

first we shall consider) is in our own times diametrically opposite in its application to masculine and feminine natures. The social approval bestowed upon the man who resents an insult with a blow is turned into scorn for the woman who strikes a female slanderer. The mother who delights in the agility of her son reproves with a designation of "unlady-like" the daughter who enjoys her brother's sports. How far such fictitious estimates of womanly propriety have been augmented by traditional rules of conduct it is impossible to tell. That they arose in a normal difference in muscular force may be gathered from the reflection that all primitive governments have recognized the divine right of the most powerful blow. That women succumbed to such an argument, when such was the single weapon of contest, is sufficient assurance that she was obliged to do so. No philosophical considerations of the greatest good to the greatest number awarded the field and the hearth to the male and the female respectively. Natural tendency sought natural outlets.

The position of physical dependence once accepted, the disability must tend to increase. A disuse of the defeated powers would become inevitable because any assumption of them would be apt to lessen the favor of the protector. Besides, the human mind is not so constituted as to struggle with what has been imposed upon it as a natural fact. At the same time the female undervaluation of physical ability has received additional sanction from the very direction of our civilization—a civilization which tends to the submission of physical to mental prowess.

The history of civilization is the history of mental evolution. As the savage rule of force yielded to the enlightened sway of reason, the vital energy was diverted from the organs of physical power to the vehicle of thought. The particular cultivation of any part of the frame has a tendency to depress the rest. The brain of the athlete registers a weight below the average, while a rigidly scholastic life is not calculated to harden the muscles. Human progress follows the march of the mind. The primeval majesty of the Anakim has surrendered to the spiritual fervor of the Egyptian slaves; the gigantic stature of the mediæval baron has bowed to the slight form of the cloistered monk. The inclination of our development to the supreme valuation of the intellect is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the modification of warfare. The battle-axe of a Cœur De Leon, and

the mighty arm that wielded it, have been laid in the dust by a tiny rifle-ball.

Unless it can be shown that the originally larger physique of the man endowed him with greater vitality, we may conclude from the considerations just debated that the smallness of woman's frame does not preclude her from sharing alike with man in the species of development we call civilization, and which represents the annals of a decline in muscle, nor from claiming full equality in the new ethical code which is valuable in proportion as it is the wise outgrowth of that civilization.

A superior vitality of the masculine frame cannot be asserted, unless active force triumph over endurance. The real worth of physical power as a factor of future progression lies in the measure of its capacity to endure mental strain. Now endurance, or latent power, is known to be the characteristic of womanly nature. The argument that such endurance must be diverted from the support of mental activity to the bearing of physical ailments is less valid than it appears. That woman is not a victim, destined to be divinely tortured into a state of chronic invalidism, is proved from the observation of those whose natural forms have not been distorted, and who have had the same opportunities for physical exercise as their brothers have enjoyed. The functions of motherhood might indeed seem a clog to the mental advance to a portion of the sex, but that result is by no means a necessary and natural one. Even among men, except among the minority whose lives are devoted to study, mental effort is sporadic rather than continuous. A constant enlargement of woman's opportunity may be argued from the consideration that, in general proportion to the increase of cerebral culture, the intervals between motherhood show a tendency to lengthen.\*

We will now examine the second proposition, or the interdependence of brain quantity and mental range. Craniological researches present several points favoring a ratio between cerebral avoirdupois and caliber of thought. The principal of these suggestions are the following: †

Civilized nations possess a greater weight of brain, and they display a wider variation in individual bulk than savage peoples.

\* See "A New Theory of Population," *Westminster Review*, April, 1852, by Herbert Spencer; also "Principles of Biology," II., Chapter 13.

† See J. B. Davis's "Thesaurus Craniorum," Appendix A.

The decided superiority of civilized peoples, both in culture and in brain size, intimates a ratio between the degree of education and the increase of the organ of thought. This phenomenon, however, merely indicates the fact that education augments brain, and not that normal size represents innate capacity. The periodical examination of the brains of the negro during the intellectual evolution of that lately emancipated race, would demonstrate the truth of an educational augmentation. The mental significance of native bulk can only be reached by applying an identical test to different peoples whose original brains are not identical in weight. The African aborigines, for instance, are superior to the Australian by several ounces of cranial pulp. Any measure of the respective abilities of the two races, based solely upon their respective brain weights, would be unjust and unscientific. Both must be subjected to the same advantages before a natural difference of capability can be maintained.

Like evidence is absent in the contrast between the mental power of man and woman. The fact that the brains of the male savage are larger than those of his mate, cannot be considered expressive of his greater native capacity, unless such capacity is distinctly enunciated in the course of co-education. Conscientious missionary work may in time supply statistics in this branch of inquiry—statistics whose compilation has heretofore appeared inconsistent with a spiritual calling.

The radical diversity of sexual training in cultivated nations forbids a common measurement. An inherent disability to avail herself of national progress cannot be predicated of the female unless the same inducements to culture have been offered her as have tempted the male. A glance at history will show that no inducement for self-cultivation has been held out to woman. The primitive peoples, cognizant only of the force of muscle, and unsuspecting any other attribute in the obtaining of power until their own development pointed out such attribute, chose for their king the most able in the ability which savage life demanded. In the first estimate of fitness no prejudice could mingle, and had woman been possessed of greater muscular power, a race of Amazons would probably be dilating now upon the naturally restricted sphere of male progress. When, however, humanity had been divided by physical divergence into a ruling and a ruled caste, a traditional law was established against innovation. The king, discovering that a cultivation apart from

that of the body was demanded in order to retain ascendancy, availed himself of his legal and domestic power to render that culture peculiar to the royal line, lest the force accumulated by serfs would threaten his throne. This is the compendium of woman's position.\* That it is not her natural and necessary place is strongly suggested by the prevailing struggle of the female for a fair test of her abilities. If such a struggle is entered, and such a right claimed only when the human mind has become cultivated, may it not be fairly argued that such claim and such struggle were not made in an earlier portion of the course because of some extraneous coercion? That coercion was the right of might, which progress, with the minority as its ensign-bearer, is about to reverse.

While no actual standard of the relation between normal brain mass and capacity has been found, an undefined ratio between increase of size and of thought is confirmed by the larger general variation in the brains of cultured than in those of barbarous peoples, together with the specific finding of remarkably heavy ones in some distinguished men. The savage brain, exposed to a comparatively meager number of mental considerations, diverges little from the normal average weight, while the cultivated organ, influenced by the varied and conflicting ideas which arise from the accession of knowledge, shows an almost individual diversity. The members of an untutored race worship a common divinity in the national god or gods; in the cultured, each thinker constructs his special deity, and a wider polytheism becomes an outgrowth of civilization. Hence it appears that the larger variation in the brains of educated nations may be considered indicative of the range of their education. The measurements of J. Barnard Davis† show a greater proportional difference between the developed male and female brains, than between those of the savage man and woman. If both these propositions are true, the latter points, by the same process of reasoning as that by which the former was attained, to a greater divergence in the culture of the civilized male and female, and not to a natural defect, as the cause of such divergence.

Upon reviewing the anatomic facts presented, we may argue that Cuvier's additional fourteen and a half ounces of pulp indicates the supremest mental development yet reached by his race, but we cannot logically conclude that the French savant's

\* See Mill's "Subjection of Woman." † "Thesaurus Craniorum," Appendix A.



remarkable brain weight denotes a higher progress than would be signified by a like increase in the aboriginal Australian, above the probably lower avoirdupois in the normal organ of the latter.

The discovery of exceedingly large idiot brains, and of unusually heavy healthy ones apart from distinguished ability, does not act as adverse evidence against a relation between increase of thought and cerebral size. A rheumatic leg may bear a superficial likeness to the limb of an athlete, and the clergyman, born of a race of smiths, may possess a muscle out of all proportion to his calling. Still, while the anatomic finding of large brain weights in men of ability is limited to a few special cases, and, while noticeably acute intellects are perceived co-existent with brains which exhibit no remarkable development, the general conclusion that accession of thought does tend to the increase of its organ cannot be safely converted into a law which shall estimate individual progress by the size of individual brain.

Miss Hardaker's final physiological statement that quality of thought represents quality of structure is gratuitous. Medical science records no essential dissimilarity in the constitution of the male and female brains apart from their difference in size. The quality of material, and the cranial circulation, appear to be identical.\*

In Miss Hardaker's search for a physiological principle to cover the variation of quality in thought, her faulty reasoning is most clearly displayed by a recourse to the *petitio principii*. Her revolving logic takes this form: "The question of (brain) quality can be readily settled by an appeal to facts. . . . The intellectual and æsthetic productions of men are of finer quality than those of women. . . . While the physiological fact remains, the psychological one must keep it company."

Let us now examine her psychological observations apart from their physiological connection. The bill of indictment which Miss Hardaker brings against her sex is comprehensive; its numerous counts are, however, summarized in the opening paragraph of her psychological diary.

\* The cerebellum is, by some authorities, estimated to be proportionately larger in woman than in man (see Solly's "Human Brain," second edition, page 173), but no special significance is attached by them to this variation. Thurnam observes a larger ratio of brain to body in the male, Tiedemann in the female. Todd ("Anatomy of the Brain," etc., page 190) denies that there is any difference between male and female cerebellum.

Woman does not think as deeply nor as broadly as man, neither does she desire to compete in this particular. Here is the large generalization which covers a multitude of feminine sins. While thought is the prime motor of human progress, that which is inferior in comprehensiveness and profundity can never be eminently valuable under such progress. If woman does not think as deeply or as broadly as man, she is prevented by that very fact from grasping large ideas and communal interests. She must perforce confine her activity to the individual, and refrain from making states or ruling them; from discovering, inventing, or excelling in art and literature, and from propagating religions. All these directions of human ability call for preëminence of thought in proportion to their success.

But the discovery of universal inefficiency in the female could be of no ethical value whatever, unless, on the one hand, such inefficiency could be proved to be the result of native incapacity, or unless past restrictions were continued indefinitely. The constant enlargement of the field of woman's usefulness forbids the acceptance of the latter alternative. The former alone is entitled to consideration.

In reviewing the physiological distinctions between the sexes, the causes leading to the present adjustment of woman's position were discussed. Psychologically, the evolution of power, both domestic and governmental, may be roughly classified under three heads: Tyranny, Revolution, Republic. The moral claim of moral fitness, in its application to the right of competition in labor, and to the privilege of suffrage, is a direct outgrowth of the latest civilization, and is so far opposed to autocracy of muscle or hereditary right that it supposes each man "fit" until he is proved to be the contrary.

The phase of government which the van of mankind has reached is now the goal of woman. Her revolution has been tardy because her household Tyrannus has riveted closer chains than the political one. His divine right is enforced by her fear of bodily torture, of privation when separated from the provider of the very minutiae of existence, of loss of love, of the very conversion of the brute force of muscle to the brutal force of the sneer. But her revolution, though late, has begun, and now she pleads for a fair trial of those abilities which constitute masculine title to superiority. She cries for recognition as a creature of the same species, and her claim must be conceded, if any

special effort of hers has shown that thought in general masculine limits is not inconsistent with womanly nature. If any one of her sex has been known to transcend its alleged capability, this exception so far invalidates the general conclusion as to suggest hidden possibilities for the sex, and these possibilities are augmented as the exceptions increase. If one queen has been acknowledged by her own force of character, if one great female artist or thinker has been given to the world, the rule of structural incapacity no longer holds. The general acceptance of the maxim that the exception proves the rule is an example of the pernicious grasp of a proverb upon the human mind. The exceptional is ever the index of the possible.

Now, certain feminine capabilities may be logically inferred from a careful reading of Miss Hardaker's female biography. "The main psychological distinction between men and women is that men think more than women, and their thinking is of a better quality because it is chiefly carried on in the form of reasoning, and is drawn from a wider field of facts." . . . Brain activity is a constant phenomenon in both sexes, but much of this activity is merely emotional in woman. . . . If the mind be brought into continual contact with large facts and extensive interests, it makes a continual effort to take in such interests. . . . Women must gain such an intellectual culture as shall lift them out of their exclusive indulgence of the emotions."

While woman's province is restricted to home, which is the center of the emotions, her activity will naturally find vent therein, but a recognition of her right of competition with masculine exertion will call larger powers into activity. Niagara cannot be considered permanently unfit for utilitarian purposes because it now expends itself in scenic effects.

Self-reliance is new in the history of woman. Civilization is slowly opening the tradition-barred gates of justice to allow her to plead her cause in its halls. It is but a short time ago that the greatest novelist of the age deemed the assumption of a masculine title a surer method of securing entrance and hearing than the presentation of the feminine name and claim of Marian Evans.

Since experiment has been tried in the removal of some feminine disabilities, what are the results of the test? Female applicants for admission to medical colleges, who were impeached in the accusation that they sought only additional stimulus for emo-

tional excitement, who were branded by the dogma that they were incapable of close and thorough study, now successfully compete in clinical halls with male students, and beyond them with male practitioners. Schools in which co-education is the basis of instruction report that the female maintains fully as high a class standing as the male. Women supplied with an incentive for study do not spend their school hours in dreaming of the possible heroes that shall give them daily bread for a just proportion of caresses.

As particular evidence of the general incapacity, Miss Hardaker declares that the highest flight of the female mind cannot equal the supreme effort of the male. Excluding George Eliot as an abnormal specimen of womanhood, Miss Hardaker contends that no woman can be compared to Shakespeare, nor do Mrs. Browning, Madame de Staël, or Charlotte Brontë equal Schiller, Goethe, or Auerbach in common branches of literature; while in more abstruse departments no near approach to male excellence has been attempted by the female. Now, the same law that excludes Eliot from the pale of legitimate womanhood must bar Shakespeare from the circle of natural manhood. To say that there may be difference of opinion in regard to the merits of the other writers named cannot be deemed an evasion of the issue. But the truth that women have become distinguished in fiction rather than in exact science admits of strict analysis. Imagination, the store-house of the poet and novelist, is stimulated less by a wide accession of facts than a deep insight into ordinary emotions. The *Iliad* was not the lesser epic because Homer was unacquainted with true geography, nor are Shakespeare's dramas less valuable because *Coriolanus* wears the verbal garb of an Anglo-Saxon warrior. Women, confined to an observation of the human heart and its manifestations, were fitted by their surroundings to portray the emotions. A modicum of culture, necessary to afford facility of expression, was required, and that modicum infinitely enlarged has enabled the greatest of literary women to present, in her preëminently imaginative novels, an exact philosophy of human emotions. The same observations, apparently applicable to art and measurably to oratory, cannot really be so considered, because these accomplishments, unlike literature, require a wider study and a more powerful impetus than can be obtained in the confinement of home.

If the recorder of human feeling is not primarily dependent

upon extraneous education, the scientist, the mathematician, the historian, and even the higher religious reformer, is directly so supported. The precise difference between the influence of the boy who sends his kite to the skies and Franklin, lies wholly in the profound research of the latter, which draws heavenly fire with a child's plaything. Only years of devotion to study enable Newton to extract a law of universal gravitation from the fall of an apple, or Mommsen to write a philological history of Rome, or Swedenborg to become more than a spasmodic revivalist. Until a thorough education is applied to woman, we cannot assert that she is incapacitated to discover a law of animal magnetism, nor would an accusation of general inferiority be warranted even if she could never construct a *pons asinorum*.

Miss Hardaker presents yet another factor of permanent masculine superiority. It is the actual gain in time. For thousands of years men have been studying while women have been mentally idle, and the "same stimulating circumstances which impel women forward will act with equal force on man. So, unless he play the rôle of tortoise" (Miss Hardaker means *hare*), or even if he play the rôle for hundreds of years, he will still excel in the intellectual race.

Let us inquire in what intellectual particulars man is in advance of woman. The apparent gains are two—the accumulative possession of more numerous ideas acquired by the male in course of progress, and the habits of reflection generated by such accumulation. These facilities look more formidable than they actually are. Woman, by the involuntary process of nature, is prevented from remaining isolated in the march of civilization. The female child is as truly the heir of the father as the male. Though repression in the daughter and education in the son may occasion forced mental distinctions, yet it is undoubtedly true that the more enlightened the father the more capable the daughter. Place the male and female side by side on the road to learning. What indigenous advantage has the former? Ideas, we affirm. Not so, replies closer thought. Ideas themselves are neither innate nor structurally transmitted. They must be the peculiar acquisition of each individual. The knowledge previously garnered by the thought and experience of men is the historical inheritance of the girl as well as of the boy. She need not be taught hieroglyphics while he memorizes the modern alphabet. She will not seek the heights of philosophy in the

vagaries of the Ionian school while he engages his attention with Darwin and Hækel. Male and female alike use the hoarded knowledge of ages as the scaling-ladder of common ascent.

If actual ideas are not transmitted, still habits of mind may be so perpetuated. The masculine nature, from its long-continued contact with wider interests and more numerous ideas, has acquired more accurate habits of thought. Herein lies the real advantage, and only time, whose every division shall record greater mental effort for accuracy on the part of woman, can remedy the discrepancy. The results of freedom are already felt. The pressure of unmoved prejudice bearing upon each woman who seeks a new channel of activity, and the invariable law of competition calling for the survival of the fittest, make her stimulus to exact habits of thought greater than that which urges her male competitor. With such impulses a habit ought to be acquired in a few generations. The intellectual evolution of four centuries, unstimulated by the spurs which goad women to higher activity, has transformed Goetz von Berlichingen into a transcendental philosopher.

When we dismiss as frivolous the conclusion that woman cannot comprehend and manage large interests, because she has administered her restricted duties with much ability, we close the mental indictment, and meet with a new phase of female depravity. Miss Hardaker perceives a glaring hypocrisy and unscrupulousness on the part of woman. The "philosophic spirit" which prompts Miss Hardaker to object to the exceptional woman as an indication of female capability, sets up a being outside the pale of honest womanhood to display the positive existing infirmities of the sex. Miss Hardaker must be singularly unfortunate in her companionship, or she must be afflicted with a moral bias similar to that possessed by "Ouida," when she adduces as a type of her sex the female who paints her face and furnishes stolen ideas, to win the favor of men; the wife who habitually takes money from her husband's purse while he is asleep, to supply reasonable needs. Such instances cannot be fairly introduced as typical, unless the inhabitants of our prisons be displayed as examples of our civilization. Miss Hardaker, however, does not believe this defect a native one. She deplores and advocates the removal of a sexual dependence which has necessarily fostered a disease so apparent to her—a dependence which, if her previous reasoning be correct, is the

adjustment of structural diversity, and therefore, in any wide sense, incapable of removal.

With a statement of woman's moral delinquency the review of sexual peculiarities is ended, and Miss Hardaker is moved to express her opinions on female suffrage. Her syllogisms take this form:

Women cannot grasp large interests; the state is the largest of interests; hence women cannot make states.

Moral fitness constitutes moral claim; women have no moral fitness to govern; hence they have no claim to govern.

Yet, adds the reasoner, "There is no natural law which should keep women from exercising the suffrage power. . . . No one can deny them the right to vote." It is hardly possible to correct such logical obliquity with proper seriousness. To do so, however, it is sufficient to state briefly the fundamental principle on which the right of suffrage is based.

The state is an artificial institution that protects the community against individual aggression, and expediency, not nature, declares what individual in the community shall have a right to legislate for the society of which he is a part. No independent natural law can be produced which can entitle any being to a share in politics. Human reason may discover a law that prevents men from flying, or from breathing under water, but no structural distinction which compels an individual to be a voting or non-voting animal. Now, if it is true that woman cannot grasp the large interests involved in the use of the vote, the right can and ought to be denied her by the very standard of fitness that Miss Hardaker has adopted, and which, by its estimate of natural capacity, becomes relatively a natural law; she must be excluded from the ballot on the same grounds upon which lunatics and minors are denied that privilege. But if, as we have shown, no native disability for comprehending large interests can be affirmed of woman, she may for reasons of expediency, and must for reasons of justice, be granted a trial in legislation.

Perhaps the key to Miss Hardaker's flexibility of conclusion is the consideration of the superior fitness in moral suasion to argument in dealing with the softer sex. The female tax-payer is patted metaphorically upon the back, and induced by flattery to relinquish on patriotic grounds that which she may claim on personal.

"No one can deny you the right to vote," whispers the mentor. "You need not eat the cake because it is set before you. Even though politics might develop your mental power (thus making you more independent and less hypocritical), the exercise of legislation would be disastrous to you, because you would not be so happy in the study of political economy as in that of character. Your brain energy, now expended in emotional excitement, would be diverted to political channels, and thus led away from æsthetic and other light sports in which you may be harmless though never supreme. Besides, you are not required in the administration of state; all its work can be better done than by you, and you could add no advantageous element to government, because (even though yourself morally debased at present) you would seek the character of the candidate rather than the good of the community. You need not fear missing a share in the benefits of legislation so long as you can influence the favor of men. Then, too, you do not actually want to vote, you know. Most women repudiate the idea, and really good men keep away from the polls. Politics is an unclean game, and soils dainty fingers."

Such is Miss Hardaker's intellectual juggling, stated in its proper form and devoid of rhetorical embellishment. To it a few words of reply may not be untimely.

How women can best be happy, and what offices of government they are less capable of filling than men, remain to be demonstrated. Miss Hardaker is no more justified in asserting an invariable dictum on these topics than the quondam discoverers of "woman's sphere" were authorized to depict the nursery and the kitchen as the natural continents superincumbent upon a sea of emotionality.

The fact that the majority of women do not want to vote is no measure of the propriety of the minority's claim. The Russian peasant, ignorant of the advantages of liberty, is irresponsible to the great idea for which the student is battling. We have already discussed the impediments to a sexual revolution. Not long ago, Mrs. Oliphant, in an article upon the "Grievances of Woman," confessed that fear of ridicule and abuse now prevents women of her own caliber from becoming publicly identified with the Woman's Movement.

A Diogenes lamp is not needed for one to perceive that Miss Hardaker sets a premium upon female dissimulation, when per-



sonal influence upon men is to be the means of obtaining favorable legislation for women; nor is the Greek's lantern required to show that politics are impure because the best men do not fulfill their duties as citizens at the ballot-box, and because the personal character of the candidate is less sought than his availability for party triumph. If Miss Hardaker's prophecies be true, they point to the fact that women are peculiarly fitted to supply a primary element of good government, whose absence is now widely deplored.

The discussion of Female Suffrage virtually concludes Miss Hardaker's exposition of sexual ethics. Yet in view of the fact that another element of sexual relation (although one not arising from the considerations discussed) presents its demand for attention, she adds an inconsequential appendix. She desires her disciples to understand her repugnance to Free Love, as an item in the statute-book of the coming race.

But here our refutation ends. We do not propose to follow Miss Hardaker's labyrinthian speculations through any extraneous topic. The object of this writing has been to show that Miss Hardaker's physiological and psychological statements are inaccurate and incomplete in themselves, and valueless in their application to a permanent ethical code. We have presented the truth that physical size cannot be shown as a factor in our mental development; that the ratio between normal quantity of brain and of brain power has not been scientifically determined; that no essential variation between the constitutions of male and female brains is known to exist; and that existing mental traits cannot be found indicative of the real female nature, because no scope has been afforded to womanly endeavor. Collaterally, we have produced evidence of a higher capability in woman—evidence gathered from Miss Hardaker's statements themselves, and from the only facts upon which her dicta might be founded.

A glance at the appendix, however, is in the line of our purpose, because it will serve to exhibit the "intense personality" which has modified her decisions. Her prejudice against her sex is strikingly displayed in the beginning of the "free-love" discussion. Miss Hardaker says:

"The very great majority of women, with their inability to take in facts in their larger relations, have nothing but utter condemnation for a movement which attempts the destruction of the

family in the name of reform. The majority of advocates of this social theory are men, who show that they have thought on the question, but that their conclusions have neglected some of the influential facts."

It may be aptly questioned whether family sanctity cannot be defended on broader moral, social, and political grounds than can the theory by which Miss Hardaker tries to enlighten the male "free-lover." We shall not discuss the comparative value of a hypothesis which restricts the ideal to unity because the multiplication thereof would require a multiplication of brain activity, and so divert thought from its proper channel. We can but wonder at the erratic path of the logic that seeks in strange ways the solution of a problem which its own course has clearly indicated.

When the avenues of advancement are thrown open to woman, she will no longer be compelled to seek marriage as a means of self-protection. Her honored exertions can supply her physical wants, and remove the necessity for emotional excitement as a safety-valve for superfluous energy. No incentive will then be offered to artificial charms that allure but to disappoint, because wedlock will be embraced only if it appear to better her condition, and such improvement in the lot of a cultured woman must rest upon her congeniality of purpose with her husband. She will therefore insist that his standard of morality be as elevated as her own, and thus she will sanctify marriage by removing the fictitious sexual distinctions which the power of the male has imposed upon the dependence of the female. Equality, intellectual and moral, is the key to the sexual problem.

NINA MORAIS.